DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 293 441 HE 021 354

AUTHOR Moden, Gary O.; And Others
TITLE The Role, Scope, and Functions of the Chief Academic Officer. AIR 1987 Annual Forum Paper.
PUB DATE May 87
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association of Institutional Research (27th, Kansas City, MO, May 3-6, 1987).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; *Administrator Characteristics; *Administrator Responsibility; *Career Ladders; *College Administration; Higher Education; Institutional Research; National Surveys; Two Year Colleges; Universities
IDENTIFIERS *AIR Forum

ABSTRACT

Results of a national survey of chief academic officers are reported, with attention to their professional background and aspirations, how their time was spent and structured, and the scope of their position. Responses were obtained from a national random sample of 331 colleges and universities that was stratified based on student full-time equivalent size of the institution. To provide an overview of the national perspective of chief academic officers, the sample was weighted to represent the total universe of 3,328 institutions. The fall 1985 data were obtained from the U.S. Department of Education. Eight titles were identified for the position of chief academic officer. Additional information included: the age range of the chief academic officers; the mean salary; previous positions held by the officers; current involvement of the officers in teaching or research; the organizational units that reported directly to the officers; how the officers spent their time each week (group meetings, individual meetings, individual activities, and official social activities); a rating as to difficulty for 14 areas likely to confront the officers; differences for chief academic officers at two- and four-year institutions; and satisfactions and dissatisfactions associated with their responsibilities. 12 references. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED293441

The Role, Scope, and Functions of The Chief Academic Officer

Gary O. Moden
Richard I. Miller
A. Michael Williford

Office of Institutional Research
Ohio University

Athens, Ohio 45701
(614) 593-1059

Paper presented at the 27th Annual Forum of

The Association for Institutional Research

Kansas City, Missouri, May 3 - 6, 1987.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AIK

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

HE 021 354

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

for Management Research, Policy Analysis, and Planning

This paper was presented at the Twenty-Seventh Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research held at the Vista International Hotel, Kansas City, Missouri, May 3-6, 1987. This paper was reviewed by the AIR Forum Publications Committee and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC Collection of Forum Papers.

Ann K. Dickey
Chair and Editor
Forum Publications Editorial
Advisory Committee

Teresa Karolewski
Associate Editor

Abstract

Much research has been done on the college or university president, but very little research has been done on the chief academic officer. This paper reports results of a national survey of chief academic officers on various aspects of their positions. This survey addressed the professional background and aspirations of chief academic officers, how their time is spent and structured, and the scope of their position. Since institutional researchers often report to or at least come in contact with chief academic officers at their institutions, it is important for a factural base of information to be presented about them.

The Role, Scope, and Functions of The Chief Academic Officer

Most research on upper higher education management has focused on the president. Little research has focused on the chief academic officer (i.e., provost, academic dean, vice president for academic affairs). Yet the study of the chief academic officer (CAO) is important to the study of higher education because the chief academic officer is vital to each institution. Understanding the chief academic officer is important for institutional researchers because the reporting structure of most institutions often brings institutional researchers and chief academic officers together. Institutional researchers need to understand the chief academic officer in order to know how best to assist them with their function. This paper describes a study designed to identify valuable information about the chief academic officer.

Unlike the president, who is recognized as the ultimate authority within the institution, the chief academic officer's role is more ambiguous. Indeed, Wolverton (1984) identified four different "dimensions" of relationships with which the chief academic officer must deal. These dimensions are in terms of relationships with the president and/or governing boards, deans and others who report directly to the chief academic officer, administrative officers in roles complementary to the academic area, and peers at the vice presidential level.

There has been much speculation done about the chief academic officer, and many assumptions have been made about the position.

Indeed, the single existing major publication on the chief academic officer, Leadership Roles of Chief Academic Officers, New Directions for Higher Education no. 47, does not include any substantial information about the nature of the position. For example, Brown (1984) stated that the position of chief academic officer is without structure, that "the position of CAO is defined by its occupant" (p. 1). Wolverton (1984) described the chief academic officer in relation to other administrators. He discussed qualities of successful chief academic officers and typical responsibilities, but he provided no evidence for his discussion. Other contributors to this publication provided suggestions of "how to" function as a successful chief academic officer (Hynes, 1984; Moomaw, 1984; Oppelt, 1984), but none of them identified how chief academic officers function.

Few studies on the chief academic officer have provided information in great depth. There have been studies and discussions of academic deans (Bowker and Lynch, 1985; Sagaria and Krotseng, 1986). O'Meara (1984) provided an anecodotal discussion of the chief academic officer, but this discussion does not describe the typical CAO. Other publications have mentioned the chief academic officer (e.g., Bowker and Lynch, 1985; Dill, 1984), but they have not focused on detailed descriptions of the position of the people occupying current chief academic officer position.

There have been many studies on college and university presidents. Stadtman (1980) provided results of the 1978 Carnegie Council survey of presidents that focused on perspectives of major issues, positive and negative changes in institutions, and general trends in higher

education. Cohen and March (1974) conducted a landmark study of the college presidency. They conducted interviews with presidents and those who work with presidents in order to get detailed information about the presidency. They provided information on career paths to the presidency, characteristics of current presidents, organization of time, presidential tenure, aspirations and/or plans for departure, and responses/reactions to the institutional environment.

The results of the study reported in this paper are closely related to the results of the Cohen and March (1974) study. This study focuses on the role of the chief academic officer, such as day-to-day activities and responsibilities; the scope of the position, such as offices that report to them and characteristics of the position; and functions of the person in the position, such as how they spend their time and what duties they perform. Preliminary results of this study were mentioned in The Chronicle of Higher Education (Watkins, 1985).

Method

For this study to have a national perspective a national sample was utilized. The most recent computer tape of information on colleges and universities, fall 1985, was obtained from the United States Department of Education, Office for Educational Research and Improvement. This data tape contained information on 3,328 institutions of higher education and their branches as reported in the Fall 1983 Enrollment Survey. Information on the tape included campus name, address, chief academic officer, and full-time equivalency enrollment. To be able to analyze information in a number of different settings, a stratified random sample was dawn based on student FTE size of the institution. Seven size categories were selected in drawing the

stratified sample, which were: less than 1,000; 1,000 to 2,499; 2,500 to 4,999; 5,000 to 9,999; 10,000 to 19,999; 20,000 to 29,999; and 30,000 or more. Seventy institutions were randomly selected from each of the first six categories and in the largest category, 30,000 or more, all 31 institutions were selected. This process provided a national stratified random sample of 451 colleges and universities.

A survey instrument was developed to survey the role, scope, and functions of the chief academic officer. The design included questions pertaining to the background of the institution; demographic, teaching and research information concerning the chief academic officer; and professional background and career aspirations. The majority of the instrument collected information on the day-to-day activities of the chief academic officer. These included units that reported to the person and ease of functioning with these units. Detailed information was collected on how the chief academic officer's time was spent. Areas of difficulty in decision making, and of areas of greatest satisfaction and dissatisfaction were collected. Finally, chief academic officers were given the opportunity, through an open ended question, to give their advice to neophyte chief academic officers.

The instrument was field tested with a number of active chief academic officers, and suggested changes were made to the final version. A letter and questionnaire were sent to each of the 451 chief academic officers in the sample. After a period of six weeks, a follow-up letter and questionnaire were sent to those chief academic officers who had not responded.

Of the sample of 451 colleges and universities, 331, or 73 percent returned usable questionnaires. The response rates were similar for each of the institutional size categories and therefore respresentative of the original stratified sample.

Results

To provide a general overview of the national perspective of chief academic officers, the stratified sample was weighted to represent the total universe of the 3,328 institutions. This would provide a profile of the average chief academic officer without regard to the size of institution stratification.

The background of the institution represented by the weighted sample included 56 percent public institutions and 44 percent private institutions. Two-year degree granting institutions made up 40 percent of the group, baccalaureate degree only 19 percent, baccalaureate and masters equaled 26 percent, and comprehensive doctoral granting institutions represented 15 percent of the weighted sample. Faculty unions were in place at 25 percent of the institutions while 75 percent had no faculty union.

The position of chief academic officer is called many things at the various institutions across the nation. Eight different titles were used most often by the respondents in identifying their current title. Academic dean was the most prevalent (33 percent), followed by vice president for academic affairs (27 percent), dean of instruction (14 percent), and provost (11 percent), vice president (nine percent), vice president instructor (four percent), and vice chancellor (two percent).

The age range of chief academic officers varied from a low of 34 years to a high of 67 years. The mean age for the position was 49 years, and the mode was 47 years. The tenure of the position produced some very interesting results, as 22 percent of the group held their current position for one year or less. One year or less was also the mode, while the mean tenure was 5.3 years compared to a median of only 3.9 years, which reflected the high percentage that held the position for one year or less. Less than 14 percent of the group had held their current position for ten years or more, and only 35 percent held their current positions for 5 years or more.

Males held 81 percent of the positions compared to only 19 percent for females. The mean salary was $50,092 for chief academic officers from all types of institutions.

The career ladder of the chief academic officer is logically linked to holding faculty positions at either their current institution or another institution (see Table 1). Sixty-eight percent of the chief academic officers held a faculty position at another institution with a median years service of 7.0, while 52 percent of the chief academic officers held faculty positions at their current institution with median service of 7.5 years. Being a dean or department chairman at their current institution appeared more helpful in their career ladder to the chief academic officer, as 31 percent held a dean's position and 29 percent held department chair positions compared to 23 percent who held department chair positions at another campus and 22 percent who held a dean's position at another campus. The only other two positions that held any significant path for the chief academic officer were

associate deanship held by 17 percent of people at their current institution and 16 percent at another institution.

Insert Table 1 about here

Teaching and research are the cornerstone of academic life, and the chief academic officers were asked to respond to their current involvement in these critical activities. Based on the weighted sample, 42 percent of all the chief academic officers are currently involved in teaching. Of this group, 42 percent teach every term, 7 percent teach twice a year, 40 percent teach once per year, and 11 percent teach on an irregular basis. In grouping specific disciplines into broad academic categories, 36 percent of the teaching was done in the humanities, 18 percent in social sciences, 12 percent in general studies or freshman orientation type of classes, ten percent in physical sciences, and eight percent in business. The two specific disciplines with the highest percentage of teaching were English with 18 percent and history with 11 percent.

Research activities are currently being pursued by 26 percent of the chief academic officers. The bulk of the research activities reported was being done in the field of higher education with chief academic officers reporting research projects in retention, enrollment management, cost modeling, and higher education marketing. This represented 44 percent of the research activity of chief academic officers. The next two significant areas of research for academic officers were humanities (18 percent) and social sciences (16 percent). Very little research was done in the other disciplines.

In attempting to understand the scope of the responsibilities of the position, chief academic officers were asked to indicate what organizational units reported directly to them. Academic units reported directly to the chief academic officer 85 percent of the time, and it is assumed that the other 15 percent report indirectly through an intervening level of management. Library and learning resource units report directly at 81 percent of the institutions followed by 58 percent of the deans and 55 percent of the registrars. The direct reporting relationship declines for the following units with 31 percent for admission, 23 percent for institutional research, 19 percent for institutional planning, 18 percent for student affairs, and 11 percent for financial aid. A wide variety of other units reported directly to the chief academic officers, including extension, computing, academic advising, school press, minority affairs, development, personnel, summer sessions, branch campuses, telecommunications, and graduate services.

The role of a chief academic officer incorporates a wide range of activities. In order to provide a general overview of how chief academic officers spent their time each week a number of work activity scales were developed. These were divided into four major areas: group meetings, individual meetings, individual activities, and offical social activities. Since a few individuals reported a large number of hours, the most useful measure was the median hours reported for each activity. Table 2 lists all of the activities included on the four separate scales ranked from highest to lowest in median hours per week.

Insert Table 2 about here

Two individual activites ranked the highest with drafting responses first with 3.69 hours per week and reading mail 3.39 hours per week. Group meetings of standing committees and the dean's group occupied the next segment of time followed by individual meetings with faculty members. Planning as an individual activity took up 2.56 hours, and reading professional material took 2.48 hours per week. The next several items on the list involve either group or individual meetings and occupied a significant amount of time when grouped together. The last four items on the list involved the ceremonial functions of the position but still occupied a large block of time. If the activities were grouped together, individual meetings would take up 17.27 hours or 32 percent of the week's time. Group meetings would occupy another 16.43 hours or 32 percent of the time. Combined group and individual meetings would require 63 percent of the chief academic officers' work week. Individual activites would involve 13.76 hours per week or 26 percent of the effort, while official social activities would take 5.93 hours or 11 percent of the weeks output.

Not all chief academic officers were involved in all activities; the best measure of their total work week was estimated to be a median of 54 hours per week. This did not include any time they would be spending in the classroom. Teaching activity on a regular basis was reported by 31 percent of the chief academic officers, and these individuals contributed another 3.2 hours per week in this activity. The median range of hours per week would vary from 54 to 57 hours depending upon the chief academic officers' involvement in classroom

teaching. There was some sight difference in the work patterns of chief academic officers at two and four-year institutions. Chief academic officers at schools that offered a two-year but less than a four-year degree worked a median of 50 hours per week and only 20 percent reported teaching a median 3.2 hours per week. At schools that offered a four-year or higher degree, chief academic officers worked 55 hours per week, and 44 percent of the chief academic officers taught for a median 3.2 hours.

The chief academic officer has to contend with a number of complex areas in the day-to-day functioning within the institution. A list of fourteen areas most likely to confront the chief academic officer were rated on a "least difficult" to "most difficult" five-point Likert scale with the lower scores indicating less difficulty. In addition to making difficult decisions, the chief academic officer must also develop a working relationship with a number of different individuals and groups. These people have varied goals and objectives that necessitate yeoman management skills on the part of the chief academic officer. As a part of this working relationship the chief academic officers were asked to judge the degree of difficulty in working with 13 various individuals and groups with a rating of '1' to '5' with '1' providing the least difficulty in a working relationship and a '5' providing the most difficulty.

Table 3 lists the areas from least to most difficult. Areas that were rated by the chief academic officer as being least difficult to make decisions were: learning resource center/library, registrar's office, admissions office, and the financial aid office. Areas of moderate difficulty of decision making were: planning, promotion,

tenure, resource allocation/academic units, merit, and department "squabbles." Areas of most difficulty were budget decisions, resource allocations to academic units, personnel decisions, and dismissal.

Table 4 presents results of an anlysis of differences between two- and four-year schools. In viewing differences between chief academic officers at schools that awarded a two-year degree and those that awarded a four-year degree or higher, several interesting findings were observed. Of the fourteen areas listed, there were significant differences in nine areas. The five areas with no significant differences were: financial aid office, promotion, merit, departmental "squabbles," and personnel decisions. In eight of the areas, chief academic officers from four-year schools reported significantly greater difficulty in decision making. These areas were: learning resource center/library, registrar's office, budget decisions, and resource allocation. In the area of learning resources center/library, seven percent of four-year chief academic officers had difficulty in decision making compared to four percent of the two-year officers. The same was true with the registrar's office, as seven percent of the four-year people had difficulty compared to only three percent of the two-year group. In the relationship with the admissions office, 12 percent of the four- year academic officers had difficulty, compared to only two percent of two-year people. Tenure decisions also provided some significant differences as 46 percent of the four-year academic officers had difficulty making decisions in this area compared to 29 percent of the two-year officers. Resource allocation proved difficult for 46 percent of the four-year staff compared to 32 percent of the two-year academic officers. Budget decisions were marked as difficult

by 51 percent of the four-year respondents compared to 42 percent of their two-year counterparts. Differences were also found in resource re-allocation as 55 percent of the four-year respondents, compared to 45 percent of the two-year respondents, found that process difficult.

Two-year respondents experienced greater difficulty than four-year respondents in two areas. Planning was difficult for 35 percent of the two-year chief academic officers compared to 27 percent of the four-year chief academic officers. Dismissal decisions were most difficult for 67 percent of the two-year group compared to 53 percent of the four-year people.

Insert Table 3 and 4 about here

Chief academic officers have the least difficulty in working with their secretaries and their own professional staff. They also reported having very good working relationships with students individually, deans individually, and student groups. Table 3 also indicates that V.P.'s as a group and deans as a group worked quite well with the chief academic officer. Three working areas showed positive working relationships, but not as positive as the seven mentioned previously. These three were faculty individually, the vice president for business, and the president or chancellor. The most difficult groups that were rated to work with were the faculty senate, faculty members in groups, and faculty unions.

Of the thirteen groups or individuals mentioned significant differences were found between two-year and four year institutions in eight of the categories. Of the five where no significant differences were found, four involved working with various types of faculty. No

significant differences were found between chief academic officers at four-year and two-year colleges in working with faculty individually, faculty senate, faculty members as a group or faculty unions. It appears that faculty exhibit the same type of working relationship with chief academic officers in each of these environments. The other areas where no significant difference was found was the working relationship with the president or chancellor. Chief academic officers at two-year colleges reported significantly less difficulty in working with students individually, 55 percent compared to 35 percent at four-year schools; students as a group, 41 percent compared to 35 percent at four-year schools; and deans individually, 55 percent at the two-year schools compared to 35 percent at four-year schools and deans as a group, 40 percent least difficult compared to 27 percent least difficult at four-year colleges. Chief academic officers at four-year schools had less difficulty in working with secretaries, 72 percent compared to 65 percent at two-year colleges, and professional staff, 61 percent, compared to 49 at two-year schools. Chief academic officers at two-year institutions reported more difficulty in working with vice presidents as a group with 14 percent indicating it was "somewhat" or "most" difficult compared to 9 percent of their four-year counterparts. While working with the vice presidents as a group was more difficult for two-year people, chief academic officers at four-year colleges had a more difficult time working with the vice president for business. Twenty percent of the four-year people rated this as "somewhat" or "most" difficult compared to 16 percent at the two-year colleges.

The position of chief academic officer has numerous satisfactions and dissatisfaction associated with its responsibilities. To guage the greatest satisfactions identified with the position, chief academic officers were asked to respond to eight anticipated satisfactions and dissatisfactions to list others that may have been omitted. Table 5 lists the satisfactions and dissatisfactions ranked by chief academic officers from high to low on a scale from '5' to '1' with '5' being the highest rating. The two highest rated satisfactions were initiating or facilitating change and helping others to achieve their goals. Both of these satisfactions had mean scores of over 4.0. Three other areas of satisfaction had mean scores of just under 4.0 and therefore were also rated as very satisfying. These areas were solving complex problems, a diversity of activities that was interesting and stimulating, and making decisions of consequence. Two anticipated satisfactions the were rated only as average were being "in" on campus life and activities and salary and other tangible benefits associated with the position. One item that was rated below average in the satisfaction scale was prestige or respectability according to the chief academic officer and his/her family.

In comparing two-year chief academic officers to four-year chief academic officers, significant differences were found in only three of the eight listed satisfactions. At two-year colleges there was greater satisfaction with a feeling of making decisions of consequence. Also, two-year people felt more positive about their salary and related benefits than their four-year counterparts. Four-year chief academic officers were more positive in the feeling of satisfaction of being able to solve complex problems than those at two-year institutions.

Insert Table 5 about here

The area of greatest dissatisfaction was the uneasiness or uncertainty of tenure in office. Chief academic officers were very concerned about this, and it is interesting to note that their actual reported tenure in office was not very long, as only 35 percent held their current positions for five years or more. Being in a "fish bowl" or under the scrutiny of several constituencies was also viewed by chief academic officers as a negative aspect of their position. The president or chancellor sometimes created frustrations for the chief academic officer, as they viewed being on call by the president as a dissatisfaction associated with the position. Two other areas that also produced some problems were the difficulty of getting a good grasp on a problem and the problem of coping with or understanding campus politics. Difficult personnel decisions were of average concern to chief academic officers but saying "no" to good ideas from good people and never enough time to do their job were not viewed as serious frustrations.

Several differences were found between chief academic officers at two-year and four-year schools concerning frustrations associated with their positions (Table 6). Two-year people were significantly less sure of their tenure in office, found personnel decisions more difficult to make and felt they were more likely to say "no" to good ideas. Four-year college chief academic officers differed significantly from their two-year counterparts in that they believed there were under more scrutiny or more in a "fish bowl" and that they were

more frustrated with campus politics on the four-year campus than deans at two-year campuses.

Insert Table 6 about here

Chief academic officers were questioned as to their career aspirations beyond the current position. The largest group (37 percent) wanted to pursue the position of president or chancellor. The next largest group (20 percent) of the chief academic officers believed their next career move would be retirement. Fifteen percent would seek another chief academic officer position while 14 percent would like to return to teaching in their discipline of study.

Discussion

There are many implications for institutional researchers in this study. Indeed, the focus of the AIR in Kansas City is on management. Since no previous work has been done in this area, institutional researchers have no source of empirical information about the chief academic officer. The findings of this study should help institutional researchers know how best to assist the chief academic officer.

Of importance to the institutional researcher is the finding that the tenure of the chief academic officer is relatively short as 22 percent of the group held their current position for one year or less. The median service was 3.9 years and only 35 percent held their position for five years or more. This could cause a fairly high turnover in the position and require an institutional researcher to work with a number of chief academic officers over their career. The different needs and styles of the chief academic officer will

necessitate institutional researcher to be flexible to meet the needs of the current incumbent. New chief academic officers will also have to be appraised of past methods of planning and management information that have preceded them at their institution.

The background of the chief academic officer is usually that of a faculty member, department chair, and dean at either their current institution or some former institution. This academic background might provide a different perspective regarding the role of institutional research compared to what is expected from practitioners in the field. Institutional researchers need to be aware of this academic perspective on the part of the chief academic officer when attempting to meet their information needs.

Over 64 percent of the chief academic officer's time is spent in meetings with individuals. Institutional Researchers can do much to expedite this time consuming work schedule by providing clear and concise information concerning the academic management of the institution. It is therefore critical that the institutional researcher be aware of the current and future concerns at the institution. Hopefully, this will occur in a proactive rather than a reactive environment.

Degree of difficulty in areas of decision making as expressed by the chief academic officer may be a positive evaluation of the current status of institutional research. Planning and resource allocation decisions were rated with average difficulty. It could be assumed that chief academic officers are being supplied with adequate information from institutional researchers to make these important decisions. Areas of more difficult decision making deal with personnel

and dismissal. This may require institutional researchers to review more closely what types of resources they have in supplying information concerning personnel and dismissal matters.

Chief academic officers reported that they had the greatest difficulty in working with faculty members as groups including faculty senate and faculty unions. We must attempt to think through how we as institutional researchers could assist the chief academic officer in working with these various faculty groups.

The greatest satisfactions for the chief academic officer comes from initiating/faciliating change, helping others achieve goals and solving complex problems. As institutional researchers we can be involved in each of these areas with the skills we have in collecting, refining, managing, and communicating information.

References

Bowker, L. H. and Lynch, D. M. (1985, March). What Every Department Chair Should Know about the Dean: Findings from Four National Surveys. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Conference, Chicago.

Brown, David G. (Ed). (1984). Leadership Roles of Chief Academic Officers. New Directions for Higher Education, no. 47. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cohen, Michael D. and March, James G. (1974). Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President. New York; McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Dill, David D. (1984). The Nature of Administrative Behavios in Higher Education. Educational Administration Quarterly, 20, 66-99.

Hynes, William J. (1984). Strategies for Faculty Development. In Brown, David G. (Ed.). Leadership Roles of Chief Academic Officers. New Directions for Higher Education, no. 47. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Moomaw, W. Edmund. (1984). Participatory Leadership Strategy. In Brown, David G. (Ed.). Leadership Roles of Chief Academic Officers. New Directions for Higher Education, no. 47. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

O'Meara, Timothy. (1984). The Notre Dame Long-Range Plan. In Brown, David G. (Ed.). Leadership Roles of Chief Academic Officers. New Directions for Higher Education, no. 47. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Oppelt, John. (1984). Sustaining Faculty Leadership. In Brown, David G. (Ed.). Leadership Roles of Chief Academic Officers. New Directions for Higher Education, no. 47. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sagaria, Mary Ann D. and Krotseng, Marsha V. (1986). Dean's Managerial Skills: What They Need and What They Bring to the Job. Journal of the College and University Personnel Association, 37, 1-7.

Stadtman, Verne A. (1980). Academic Adaptations: Higher Education Prepares for the 1980's and 1990's. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Watkins, Beverly. (1985, Noverber 27). Typical Chief Academic Officer. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 31, 21.

Wolverton, Robert E. (1984). The Chief Academic Officer: Argus on the Campus in Brown, David G. (Ed). Leadership Roles of Chief Academic Officers. New Directions for Higher Education, no. 47. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Table 1

Past Previous Academic Positions

Held By Chief Academic Officers

	Percent Held Postion	Median Years In Position
Faculty Member at Another Institution	68%	7.0
Faculty Members at Current Institution	52%	7.5
Dean at Current Institution	31%	3.7
Department Chair at Current Institution	29%	3.6
Department Chair at Another Institution	23%	3.4
Dean at Another Institution	22%	4.6
Associate Dean at Current Institution	17%	2.4
Associate Dean at Another Institution	16%	3.6
Associate V.P.A.A. Current Institution	7%	3.1
V.P.A.A. Another Institution	7%	4.7
Previous States/Federal Official	3%	5.2
President Another Institution	2%	6.5
Associate V.P.A.A. Another Institution	2%	4.7

Table 2

Median Number of Hours Spent per Week on Work Activities

Activity	Median Hours
Drafting Responses	3.69
Reading Mail	3.39
Standing Committee Meetings	2.90
Dean's Group	2.75
Meeting Individual Faculty	2.68
Planning	2.56
Reading Professional Materials	2.48
Individual Meetings with Deans	2.46
President's Cabinet Meeting	2.44
Meeting with V.P. Group	2.40
Ad hoc Community Meeting	2.37
Meetings with staff	2.32
Individual Meeting with Chairs	2.24
Individual Meeting with President	2.14
Individual Meeting with V.P.	1.87
Meeting with Planning Group	1.86
Individual Meeting with Outside Guests	1.79
Group Meeting with Committee	1.71
Walks around Campus	1.64
Ceremonial Activities	1.56
Official Dinners	1.55
Job-related Dinners	1.43
Receptions	1.39
Teaching	3.19

Table 3

Degrees of Difficulty in Areas of Decision Making and Working with Others

Area of Decision Making	Difficulty Mean Rating
Learning Resource Center/Library	1.794
Registrar's Office	1.885
Admissions Office	1.887
Financial Aid Office	1.889
Planning	2.857
Promotion	3.039
Tenure	3.109
Resource Allocation/Academic Merit	3.214
Departmental "squabbles"	3.246
Budget decisions	3.246
Resource re-allocation/academic units	3.448
Personnel decisions	3.597
Dismissal	3.657
	4.213

Group or Individual	Difficulty Mean Rating
Secretaries	1.459
Professional staff	1.592
Students individually	1.772
Deans individually	1.816
Student groups	1.882
V.P.'s as a group	2.099
Deans as a group	2.045
Faculty individually	2.251
V.P. for business	2.292
President/chancellor	2.344
Faculty senate	2.880
Faculty members in groups	2.922
Faculty union	3.075

TABLE 4

Difference between Chief Academic Officers at 2-Year and 4-Year Colleges in Difficulty in Decision Making (Percentages)

Areas	2-Year Colleges					4-Year Colleges				
	Least Difficult	Not as Difficult	Average	Somewhat Difficult	Most Difficult	Least Difficult	Not as Difficult	Average	Somewhat Difficult	Most Difficult
Learning Resource Center/Library	48	32	16	4	0	43	41	9	5	2*
Registrar's Office	48	20	29	1	2	39	42	12	4	3**
Admissions Office	48	41	9	2	0	41	32	15	10	2*
Financial Aid Office	33	20	20	1	6	43	30	20	4	3
Planning	15	18	32	23	12	14	26	33	22	5*
Promotion	12	20	37	19	12	11	14	40	26	9
Tenure	22	20	28	15	14	13	14	27	28	18**
Resource Allocation/ Academic Units	6	21	41	19	13	5	14	40	30	11*
Merit	11	14	29	35	11	8	17	29	31	15
Department "squabbles"	9	16	28	29	18	9	21	27	26	17
Budget Decisions	10	15	33	14	28	4	13	32	29	22**
Resource Re-allocation/ Academic Units	4	11	40	24	21	3	13	29	23	32*
Personnel Decisions	2	14	24	31	29	4	16	22	29	29
Dismissal	4	6	7	16	67	5	7	14	21	53*
			(N=132)					(N=199)		

*Chi-square, $p<0.05$
**Chi-square, $p<0.01$

Table 5

Greatest Satisfaction and Dissappointments

Chief Academic Officer

	Satisfaction Mean
Initiating/facilitating Change	4.176
Helping others Achieve Goals	4.131
Solving Complex Problems	3.985
Diversity of Activities	3.818
Making Decisions of Consequence	3.810
In On-Campus Life	3.125
Salary and Benefits	2.841
Prestige of Position	2.554
	Dissatisfaction Mean
Unsure of Tenure in Office	2.001
Being in a Fish Bowl	2.433
On Call by President	2.450
Difficult to Get Grasp of Problem	2.592
Coping in Campus Politics	2.691
Difficult Personnel Decisions	3.048
Saying "no" to Good Ideas	3.500
Never enough Time	3.692

TABLE 6

Differences betwen Chief Academic Officers at 2-Year and 4-Year Colleges in Greatest Dissatisfactions of Position (Percentages)

	2-Year Colleges					4-Year Colleges				
Group or Individual	Least Difficult	Not as Difficult	Average	Somewhat Difficult	Most Difficult	Least Difficult	Not as Difficult	Average	Somewhat Difficult	Most Difficult
Unsure of Tenure in Office	62	12	12	6	8	50	21	10	12	7**
Being in a Fish Bowl	26	25	24	16	9	32	27	22	13	6
On Call by President	26	17	26	15	16	38	27	19	8	8**
Difficult to get Grasp of Problem	26	25	23	16	10	25	26	22	15	12
Coping in Campus Politics	19	29	25	12	15	21	26	29	18	6**
Difficult Personnel Decisions	20	18	21	25	16	10	24	28	21	17*
Saying "No" to Good Ideas	12	11	28	18	31	9	13	16	37	25**
Never enough Time	15	11	18	20	36	10	9	18	17	46
			(N=132)					(N=199)		

*Chi-square, $p<0.05$
**Chi-square, $p<0.01$